Meeting Minutes Mercury Citizen Advisory Committee March 6, 2002 The Pyle Center, Room 313 702 Langdon Street Madison WI

Facilitator: Bert Stitt

Members Attending: Keith Reopelle, Wisconsin Environmental Decade; Russ Ruland, Muskellunge Club of Wisconsin; Annabeth Reitter, Wisconsin Paper Council; Jeff Schoepke, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Michele Pluta (alternate), Alliant Energy; Wayne Stroessner, Random Lake Association; John Coleman, Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission; Ed Newman (alternate), Wisconsin Utilities Association, Inc.; Mark Yeager (alternate), Environmentally Concerned Citizens of Lakeland Areas; Kathleen Standen, Wisconsin Electric; Dave Hoopman, Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives, Lloyd Eagan, DNR Others Attending: Marty Burkholder, Jon Heinrich, Tom Karman and Anne Bogar, DNR.

Welcome

Lloyd Eagan welcomed the Committee, acknowledging that it is a busy time for members.

Check-In Round

Bert Stitt conducted a check-in with Committee members.

February 26th Meeting Minutes Review

Anne Bogar said that the minutes for the February 26^{th} meeting were not yet complete.

Agenda Review

There were no changes to the agenda.

Committee Report Outline

Marty Burkholder reviewed the Committee Report Outline. In response to Committee member questions, Kathleen and Jeff (members of the report subgroup) noted that the subgroup is_circulating drafts electronically and adding comments to them. The Department has written the introduction for the report and subgroup members are working other sections on. Draft report sections will be made available to the Committee before the Committee's next meeting on April 10th.

Action Items:

- 1) Annabeth will join the subgroup.
- 2) If a study is referenced in the report, a cite for the study will be included so others may look it up.
- 3) Draft report sections will be made available to the Committee before the Committee's next meeting on April $10^{\rm th}$.

- 4) Jon Heinrich will work with Marty on using the public comments received on the rule to write a balanced perspective of the differing views for the "Why this rule" section of the report.
- 5) Jon and Marty will consider framing the "Why this rule" section of the report as a discussion of why a state rule versus a federal rule.

The Committee discussed its role in reviewing public comments. Some members thought it was clearly part of the Committee's charge. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that the meaning of the words "independently evaluate public comments" in DNR Secretary Bazzell's letter thanking the members for agreeing to serve on the Committee could be interpreted several ways.

Action Items:

- 1) Jon Heinrich will send the Committee an email with the public comments that are available electronically. For copies of other comments, Committee members should review the list of comments prepared earlier and ask for hard copies of the comments they wish to review.
- 2) After individually reviewing the comments, the Committee can decide as a group what it wants to do with the comments.

<u>Discussion and Recommendation of Issue 1: Agreed Schedule of Reductions</u>
The Committee had an extended discussion of Issue 1 as a practice run for the April 30-May 1 retreat. Bert did not facilitate the discussion. At the conclusion of the discussion, Bert noted that the discussion was efficient and the tone was good. He noted that it was much better than early meetings and it sounded like there were some agreements.

The agreements he heard were: 1) a quotient of mercury reduction is desirable; 2) the state rule could be more explicit about handling the state rule versus federal rule issue; and 3) reliable technology is important. He said he also heard two possible recommendations on this issue: 1) provide credits for early reductions; and 2) harmonize the state rule with the federal rule when it is promulgated.

Bottom line, he observed, the Committee can have an open discussion if Committee members get more disciplined, are brief in their comments, stay on point and avoid positional rhetoric.

Action Item:

1) For April 10th meeting, Committee members should fill in the proposed remedy column as much as possible.

TAG Issue Brief Presentation

Tom Karman made a presentation on control technologies and the MACT hammer provision. A copy of the presentation was sent electronically to Committee members.

Jeff Schoepke asked if data was available on a per unit basis, not just a facility basis, for mass cap mercury emissions. Tom said that data was available and he could provide that.

Tom said that it is important to note that the utilities are already averaging a 14% mercury reduction from fuel. Thus, a 30% emission reduction requirement equates to a 40% mercury reduction from fuel. Similarly, a 50% mercury emission reduction equates to a 57% mercury reduction from fuel and a 90% mercury emission reduction equates to a 91% mercury reduction from fuel.

Jeff asked if companies registering under proposed s. NR 427 would be eligible for tradable credits. Jon responded that that would be a step. He said that it was not automatic but the Department would look at those reductions and they would potentially be tradable.

Parking Lot

There were no items in the parking lot.

Setting Agenda for Next Meeting

The following topics and times were set for the April 10th agenda: Modeling Results (Wisconsin Utilities Association) – 1 hour TAG Briefs for Question & Answer – 2 hours Results of the Loon Study – 1 hour Committee's Report to the Secretary – 15 minutes Review of Public Comments – 30 minutes Opening/Closing – 1 hour Lunch – 45 minutes Total meeting time 6 ½ hours; agreed to meet 9:30 – 4:00

The Committee agreed that Jon and Bert would begin planning for the retreat offline.

Closing Round

Members thought the meeting went pretty well, many noting that it always takes more time than expected and there is a lot to do.

The next meeting will be Wednesday, April 10, 2002, in Room 16, J.F. Friedrick Center, 1950 Willow Drive, Madison, WI.